

AWARD DETERMINATION / NOTICE OF AWARD



ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Contract Management Unit
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3209



SOLICITATION NO. RFP ED08-0009

PDLA Faculty / Consultant

Pursuant to A.A.C. R2-7-C317 Contract Award I determine to award a contract for services to the following vendor: Insights for Learning, to provide the services required by the above referenced solicitation and further described by the offeror's proposal. This proposal was determined to be the most advantageous to the State based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation.

The procurement was conducted pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-2534 and implementing rules, and under authority delegated to the Department by the State Procurement Administrator. The Department issued solicitation number ED08-0009 on October 29, 2008.

The Department received 3 proposals and 1 No Bid in response to this solicitation by 3:00PM MST on November 19, 2007. The following vendor(s) proposals were received and reviewed for possible award;

Insights for Learning
Erin Sims
Integrated Management Associates

An evaluation panel created of four (4) members of Arizona Department of Education Staff met on November 28, 2007 to begin the evaluation of the proposals. The panel met on December 7, 2007 and determined clarifications were needed for the Insights for Learning proposal. After all information was considered a consensus meeting was held on January 8, 2008. The team included Donna Campbell, Karen Olson, Jan Amator and Noni Paris. I sat on the panel as facilitator. The panel used a detailed evaluation scoring rubric which covered the following criteria:

- A. Offeror's Experience, Expertise and Reliability
- B. Method of Approach and Implementation Plan
- C. Pricing

The committee awarded evaluation scores based on a 1000-point scale. See attached consensus summary of evaluation panel scoring.



Brian D. Ball
Sr. Procurement Specialist



Date



**BASIS OF AWARD
EVALUATION CONSENSUS POINT SUMMARY
RFP No. ED08-0009**

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION**
1575 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 364-2517
(602) 364-0598 FAX

WEIGHT: Relative importance of Evaluation Criteria.

POINTS AWARDED: Determined by consensus of Evaluation Committee. Maximum points awarded 1000 for each factor.

SCORE: Calculated by multiplying WEIGHT times POINTS AWARDED.

FINAL SCORE: The sum of the scores for the three factors of the proposal.

RANK: 1, 2, or 3.

	Offeror's Experience, Expertise and Reliability	Method of Approach and Implementation Plan	*Cost	Final Score	Final Rank
Weight:	50%	40%	10%		
Insights For Learning	Points Awarded: 750 Score: 375 Rank: 1	Points Awarded: 775 Score: 310 Rank: 1	Score: 97.5 Rank: 2	782.5	1
Erin Sims	Points Awarded: 50 Score: 25 Rank: 3	Points Awarded: 50 Score: 20 Rank: 3	Score: 100 Rank: 1	145	3
Integrated Management Associates	Points Awarded: 150 Score: 75 Rank: 2	Points Awarded: 200 Score: 80 Rank: 2	Score: ** 97.5 Rank: 2	252.5	2

*Cost score was determined by using the following formula. (Note: Lowest overall price will receive 100 points)

$\text{Lowest (Responsive Price) / Offeror's Price} \times 100 = \text{Score (maximum 100)}$

*Total price was not given in proposal. Assigned maximum price according to price sheet (\$50,000)

I hereby attest that the points awarded to each offeror were scored in accordance with the established criteria and represent my best judgment of the Offerors' Proposals.

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS:

Donna Campbell

Karen Olson

Jan Amator

Noni Paris

EVALUATION TEAM CHAIRPERSON:

Brian D. Ball



BASIS OF AWARD
Evaluation Committee Comments
RFP No. ED08-0009

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION**
1575 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 364-2517
(602) 364-0598 FAX

Integrated Management Associates

A. Offeror's Experience, Expertise and Reliability

- No evidence of knowledge or experience with NSDC Standards or evidence of awareness of NSDC standards.
- Some experience in education.
- Variety of references.
- Some work in Arizona schools.
- Experience is heavily in the private sector and higher education, rather than in the field of K-12 and Adult Education and none is in the area of developing systematic approaches to professional development for educators.
- Experience seems to be product development not professional development.

B. Method of Approach an Implementation Plan

- Narrative just restated the RFP.
- Unclear Outcomes.
- No evidence of being able to deliver another training design.
- No evidence of being able to facilitate learning activities that have been designed by others.
- Doesn't grasp continuing nature of curriculum.

Erin Sims

A. Offeror's Experience, Expertise and Reliability

- No evidence of knowledge or experience with NSDC Standards or evidence of awareness of NSDC standards.
- Lacks inclusion of references from public education sector.
- Experience is too dissimilar to services listed in RFP.
- Lacks coaching or facilitation experience.
- No evidence of being able to facilitate learning activities that have been designed by others.
- No evidence of developing and facilitating adult learning activities.
- No evidence of knowledge or experience working with the *Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement*

B. Method of Approach an Implementation Plan

- Assumes incorrect audience therefore the plan is inappropriate for the needs of this RFP and did not address most of the responsibilities within the Scope of Work.



EVALUATION POINT SUMMARY
RFP No. ED08-0009
Evaluation Committee Comments

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION**
1575 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 364-2517
(602) 364-0598 FAX

Insights for Learning

A. Offeror's Experience, Expertise and Reliability

- Offeror has broad, deep experience with the Arizona educational community and solid PDLA experience.
- Experience in a team environment setting.
- Experience with both K-12 students and adult learners.
- Successful PDLA track record and experience both as teacher and administration.

B. Method of Approach and Implementation Plan

- Offeror understands scope of work and specifies distinct roles.
- Describes collaborative approach.
- Seems to rely on business as usual approaches; however, does propose developing new tools for coaching assistance and intervention.
- Explains how feedback should be provided and analyzed.
- Provides plan on how to develop data profiles.